



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/677,403	10/01/2003	Sandeep Gulati	VIALO-27	8885
26686	7590	09/24/2004	EXAMINER	
CARL A. KUKKONEN, III C/O WUESTHOFF & WUESTHOFF SCHWEIGERSTRASSE 2 MUNICH, 81541 GERMANY			KIM, YOUNG J	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1637		
DATE MAILED: 09/24/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	10/677,403	
Examiner	GULATI, SANDEEP	
Young J. Kim	Art Unit	1637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 September 2004.
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5 and 13-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) 2,3 and 13-20 is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1,4 and 5 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) The drawing(s) filed on 01 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action responds the Amendment received on September 1, 2004.

Preliminary Remark

The amendment to the specification updating the status of the priority applications is acknowledged.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,780,589, issued August 24, 2004 (hereto referred to as the '589 patent). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other for the following reasons.

Claim 4 of the instant application is drawn to a method comprising the steps: a) segmenting the output pattern of the array using tessellation; b) interferometric enhancement of

the segmented output; c) associating the enhanced output with a specific constituent of the biological sample.

Claim 1 of '589 patent is drawn to a method for determining the presence of signals associated with specific constituents within a biological sample applied to an array of detectors by analyzing a digitized output pattern generated from the arrayed detectors, comprising the steps of: a) segmenting the output pattern using tessellation; b) interferometrically enhancing the segmented output pattern; c) determine the presence of signals associated with the specific constituents on the array.

Therefore, claim 1 of the '589 patent renders instant claim 4 obvious.

Claim 5 of the instant application is drawn to a computer program embodied on a computer readable media, said program executing the method of instant claim 1.

Claim 22, of the '589 patent is drawn to a computer program embodied on a computer readable media, said program executing the steps: a) segmenting the output pattern; b) convolves an expressor function with a spectral measurements of the segmented output to induce resonances; c) associating the measurements with the constituent of the sample.

Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 12-28 of copending Application No. 10/616,869, published as US 2004/0111219 A1, published June 10, 2004. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other for the following reasons.

Claim 1 of the instant application is drawn to a system comprising: a) a preconditioning unit for interferometric interaction; b) an interferometric unit; and c) an analysis unit. The system of Gulati et al., recited by claim 37, is drawn to a system for performing active interferometric signal analysis of static data from an array platform, which would necessarily comprise the elements of instant claim 1.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Young J. Kim whose telephone number is (571) 272-0785. The Examiner can normally be reached from 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Primary Examiner in charge of the prosecution, Dr. Kenneth Horlick, can be reached at (571) 272-0784. If the attempts to reach the above Examiners are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion, can be reached at (571) 272-0782. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Art Unit 1637 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 CFR 1.6(d)). NOTE: If applicant does submit a paper by FAX, the original copy should be retained by applicant or applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED, so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office. All official documents must be sent to the Official Tech Center Fax number: (703) 872-9306. For Unofficial documents, faxes can be sent directly to the Examiner at (571) 273-0785. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.



Young J. Kim
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1637
9/27/04

YOUNG J. KIM
PATENT EXAMINER

yjk